UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/635,041	08/04/2003	Mark A. Moraes	MORAES-SOSS-1	7259

7590 04/17/2006

Mark A. Moraes
280 Collingwood St.
San Francisco, CA 94114

EXAMINER	
SOMMERFELD, PAUL J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2168	

DATE MAILED: 04/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/635,041	MORAES ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Paul J. Sommerfeld	2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *04 August 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-43 and 45-76* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-43 and 45-76* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *04 August 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *8/4/2003*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. Claims 1-43 and 45-77 are currently pending. The Examiner notes that a claim 44 is not included in the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 3, 4, 9-11, 13-16, 20-28, 32, 34, 35, 40-42, 45-48, 52-60, and 64-76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kambhammettu et al (U.S. Publication 2003/0005109 A1).

As to claim 1, Kambhammettu et al teaches a method for managing changes in a computer system (see Abstract) comprising the steps of:

selecting processes on the computer system in accordance with input specifications (lines 5-7 of paragraph [0014], because Kambhammettu et al teaches detecting changes made by processes, the step of selecting those processes is taught inherently),

detecting changes made by the selected processes to data items (lines 5-7 of paragraph [0014]), and

storing the detected changes as records in a database (lines 7-8 of paragraph [0014]).

As to claim 3, Kambhammettu et al teaches the step of selecting change records from the database pursuant to specified criteria (lines 3-6 of paragraph [0035], the report data contains change records that were selected as a result of a query).

As to claim 4, Kambhammettu et al teaches the step of producing the selected change records in a specified output format (lines 3-6 of paragraph [0035], the report data contains change records that were selected as a result of a query).

As to claim 9, Kambhammettu et al teaches the steps of:

condensing sequences of change records to eliminate intermediate changes (lines 10-12 of paragraph [0033], compressed snapshot), and

storing the condensed sequences in the database (lines 10-12 of paragraph [0033]).

As to claim 10, Kambhammettu et al teaches the step of adding a user-specified field to a change record in the database (lines 2-5 of paragraph [0036], because the changes are stored as attributes in a relational database, inherently, the attributes or fields are user-specified).

As to claim 11, Kambhammettu et al teaches the step of terminating the detection of changes upon the occurrence of any of (i) user request, (ii) the satisfaction of conditions specified by the user, or (iii) termination of all selected processes (lines 1-2 of paragraph [0028], scheduling audits).

As to claim 13, Kambhammettu et al teaches the step of detecting changes made by one or more of the selected processes to a first data item resulting from changes to a second data item linked to the first data item (lines 5-7 of paragraph [0014], since the system is capable of detecting changes in general, it is inherently capable of detecting changes to a second data item as a result of changes to a first data item).

As to claim 14, Kambhammettu et al teaches the step of alerting a user when changes matching specified criteria are detected (lines 8-11 of paragraph [0036]).

As to claim 15, Kambhammettu et al teaches the step of transmitting information about the detected changes to a specified destination (lines 6-8 of paragraph [0031]).

As to claim 16, Kambhammettu et al teaches the steps of:

detecting changes to data items on a remote computer system by selected processes on the computer system prior to storing the changes as change records in the database (Figure 2, lines 10-14 of paragraph [0024], lines 6-7 of paragraph [0025]),

recording the identity of the remote computer system in the database (lines 9-11 of paragraph [0026] the identity of the customer acts as identification for the remote computer system), and

associating the identity of the remote computer system with the change in the stored change record (lines 9-11 of paragraph [0026]).

As to claim 20, Kambhammettu et al teaches the steps of:

recording selected processes or detected changes in a session history (lines 2-5 of paragraph [0036]), and

storing the session history as a session record in the database (lines 2-5 of paragraph [0036]).

As to claim 21, Kambhammettu et al teaches the steps of:

searching the database for any session records matching specified criteria (lines 3-6 of paragraph [0035]),

selecting change records referred to by the matching session records (lines 3-6 of paragraph [0035], the querying process includes the inherent step of selecting records matching the query specifications), and

producing the selected change records in a specified output format (lines 3-6 of paragraph [0035], report data).

As to claim 22, Kambhammettu et al teaches the steps of:

condensing sequences of change records in the session history to eliminate intermediate changes (lines 10-12 of paragraph [0033], compressed snapshot), and

storing the condensed session history as a session record in the database (lines 10-12 of paragraph [0033]).

As to claim 23, Kambhammettu et al teaches the step of adding a user-specified field to the session record (lines 2-5 of paragraph [0036], because the changes are stored as attributes in a relational database, inherently, the attributes or fields are user-specified).

As to claim 24, Kambhammettu et al teaches the step of adding additional processes to an existing session history (lines 2-5 of paragraph [0036]).

As to claim 25, Kambhammettu et al teaches the step of terminating the session history upon the occurrence of any of (i) user request, (ii) the satisfaction of conditions

specified by the user, or (iii) termination of all selected processes (lines 1-2 of paragraph [0028], scheduling audits).

As to claim 26, Kambhammettu et al teaches the step of alerting a user when a session history matching specified criteria is detected (lines 8-11 of paragraph [0036]).

As to claim 27, Kambhammettu et al teaches the step of transmitting information about the session history to a specified destination (lines 6-8 of paragraph [0031]).

As to claim 28, Kambhammettu et al teaches the steps of:

detecting changes within the session history to data items on a remote computer system (Figure 2, lines 10-14 of paragraph [0024], lines 6-7 of paragraph [0025]),

recording the identity of the remote computer system in the database (lines 9-11 of paragraph [0026] the identity of the customer acts as identification for the remote computer system), and

associating the session history with the identity of the remote computer system in the database (lines 9-11 of paragraph [0026]).

As to claim 32, Kambhammettu et al teaches a computer program product for managing changes in a computer system, comprising a computer program encoded on a computer-readable media and executable on a computer (lines 1-5 of paragraph [0017]) to:

select processes on the computer system in accordance with input specifications (lines 5-7 of paragraph [0014], because Kambhammettu et al teaches detecting changes made by processes, the step of selecting those processes is taught inherently),

detect changes made by the selected processes to data items (lines 5-7 of paragraph [0014]), and

store the detected changes as change records in a database (lines 7-8 of paragraph [0014]).

As to claim 34, Kambhammettu et al teaches said computer program selects change records from the database pursuant to specified criteria (lines 3-6 of paragraph [0035], the querying process includes the inherent step of selecting records matching the query specifications).

As to claim 35, Kambhammettu et al teaches said computer program provides the selected change records in a specified output format (lines 3-6 of paragraph [0035], report data).

As to claim 40, Kambhammettu et al teaches said computer program:

condenses sequences of change records to eliminate intermediate changes (lines 10-12 of paragraph [0033], compressed snapshot), and

stores the condensed sequences in the database (lines 10-12 of paragraph [0033]).

As to claim 41, Kambhammettu et al teaches said computer program adds a user-specified field to a change record in the database (lines 2-5 of paragraph [0036], because the changes are stored as attributes in a relational database, inherently, the attributes or fields are user-specified).

As to claim 42, Kambhammettu et al teaches said computer program terminates the detection of changes upon the occurrence of any of (i) user request, (ii) the satisfaction of conditions specified by the user, or (iii) termination of all selected processes (lines 1-2 of paragraph [0028], scheduling audits).

As to claim 45, Kambhammettu et al teaches said computer program detects changes made by one or more of the selected processes to a first data item resulting from changes to a second data item linked to the first data item (lines 5-7 of paragraph [0014], since the system is capable of detecting changes in general, it is inherently capable of detecting changes to a second data item as a result of changes to a first data item).

As to claim 46, Kambhammettu et al teaches said computer program alerts a user when changes matching specified criteria are detected (lines 8-11 of paragraph [0036]).

As to claim 47, Kambhammettu et al teaches said computer program transmits information about the detected changes to a specified destination (lines 6-8 of paragraph [0031]).

As to claim 48, Kambhammettu et al teaches said computer program

detects changes to data items on a remote computer system by selected processes on the computer system prior to storing the changes in the database (Figure 2, lines 10-14 of paragraph [0024], lines 6-7 of paragraph [0025]),

records the identity of the remote computer system in the database (lines 9-11 of paragraph [0026] the identity of the customer acts as identification for the remote computer system), and

associates the identity of the remote computer system with the change in the stored change record (lines 9-11 of paragraph [0026]).

As to claim 52, Kambhammettu et al teaches said computer program

records specified changes in a session history (lines 2-5 of paragraph [0036]), and

stores the session history as a session record in the database (lines 2-5 of paragraph [0036]).

As to claim 53, Kambhammettu et al teaches said computer program:

searches the database for any session records matching specified criteria (Figure 2, lines 10-14 of paragraph [0024], lines 6-7 of paragraph [0025]),

selects change records referred to by the matching session records (lines 9-11 of paragraph [0026] the identity of the customer acts as identification for the remote computer system), and

produces the selected change records in a specified output format (lines 9-11 of paragraph [0026]).

As to claim 54, Kambhammettu et al teaches said computer program:

condenses sequences of changes in the session history to eliminate intermediate changes (lines 10-12 of paragraph [0033], compressed), and

stores the condensed session history as a session in the database (line 5 of paragraph [0033]).

As to claim 55, Kambhammettu et al teaches said computer program adds a user-specified field to the session history (lines 2-5 of paragraph [0036], because the changes are stored as attributes in a relational database, inherently, the attributes or fields are user-specified).

As to claim 56, Kambhammettu et al teaches said computer program adds additional processes to an existing session history (lines 2-5 of paragraph [0036]).

As to claim 57, Kambhammettu et al teaches said computer program terminates the session history upon the occurrence of any of (i) user request, (ii) the satisfaction of conditions specified by the user, or (iii) termination of all selected processes (lines 1-2 of paragraph [0028], scheduling audits).

As to claim 58, Kambhammettu et al teaches said computer program alerts a user when a session history matching specified criteria is detected (lines 8-11 of paragraph [0036]).

As to claim 59, Kambhammettu et al teaches computer program transmits information about the session history to a specified destination (lines 6-8 of paragraph [0031]).

As to claim 60, Kambhammettu et al teaches said computer program detects changes in the session history to data items on a remote computer system prior to storing the session record in the database (Figure 2, lines 10-14 of paragraph [0024], lines 6-7 of paragraph [0025]),

records the identity of the remote computer system in the database (lines 9-11 of paragraph [0026] the identity of the customer acts as identification for the remote computer system), and

associates the identity of the remote computer system with the session record in the searchable database (lines 9-11 of paragraph [0026]).

As to claim 64, Kambhammettu et al teaches a data structure for facilitating management of changes in a computer system, comprising a database stored on a computer-readable media, the database having a plurality of change records, wherein each change record corresponds to a change to a data item by a process, comprising information that refers to the identity of data item changed, the process or processes effecting the change, and the nature of the change (lines 1-5 of paragraph [0036]).

As to claim 65, Kambhammettu et al teaches the change record further comprises information referring to the user initiating a change (lines 2-5 of paragraph [0036]).

As to claim 66, Kambhammettu et al teaches the change record further comprises descriptive or identifying information about the change (lines 2-5, any stored information pertaining to a change satisfies "descriptive or identifying information about the change").

As to claim 67, Kambhammettu et al teaches the database further comprises link records, wherein each link record comprises information that refers to a relationship between data items (lines 2-5 of paragraph [0036]).

As to claim 68, Kambhammettu et al teaches the database further comprises session records, wherein each session record comprises information that refers to a plurality of changes in a session history (lines 2-5 of paragraph [0036]).

As to claim 69, Kambhammettu et al teaches the session record further comprises information referring to the user initiating the session history (lines 2-5 of paragraph [0036]).

As to claim 70, Kambhammettu et al teaches the session record further comprises descriptive or identifying information about the session history (lines 2-5, any stored information pertaining to a change satisfies "descriptive or identifying information about the change").

As to claim 71, Kambhammettu et al teaches the session record further comprises information generated during the session history whereby the session record contains a count of any of (i) the number of changes detected (ii) the number of processes selected (iii) the number of linked data items changed (iv) the number of

remote change sessions initiated (lines 2-5 of paragraph [0036], the number of change records stored indicates the number of changes detected).

As to claim 72, Kambhammettu et al teaches the session record further comprises information with the identity of remote computer systems that were affected by changes in the session history referred to by the session record (lines 9-11 of paragraph [0026] the identity of the customer acts as identification for the remote computer system).

As to claim 73, Kambhammettu et al teaches the session record further comprises information referring to remote session records on remote computer systems that were affected by changes in the session history referred to by the session record (lines 9-11 of paragraph [0026]).

As to claim 74, Kambhammettu et al teaches a computer program product for managing changes in a computer system, comprising a computer program encoded on a computer-readable media and executable on a computer to:

perform searches in a database containing historical information of changes made by processes within the computer system to data items or links to data items (lines 3-4 of paragraph [0035]), and

produce the results of said searches in a specified output format (lines 5-8 of paragraph [0035]).

As to claim 75, Kambhammettu et al teaches a plurality of changes in the database are recorded in sessions which are stored as session records in the database (lines 2-5 of paragraph [0036]).

As to claim 76, Kambhammettu et al teaches remote computer systems are associated with session records in the database (lines 9-11 of paragraph [0026]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 5, 7, 8, 36, 38, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kambhamettu et al (U.S. Publication 2003/0005109 A1) in view of Ganesh et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,981,004 B2).

As to claim 5, Kambhammettu et al does not explicitly teach determining the reverse of the changes stored in the selected change records, and

applying the reverse of the selected change records to the data items referred to by the selected change records in order to return the data items to their state prior to the occurrence of the changes stored in the selected change records.

Ganesh et al teaches determining the reverse of the changes stored in the selected change records (col. 3 lines 31-34), and

applying the reverse of the selected change records to the data items referred to by the selected change records in order to return the data items to their state prior to the occurrence of the changes stored in the selected change records (Ganesh et al col. 3 lines 39-41).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the method of tracking changes taught by Kambhammettu et al by the method of undoing changes taught by Ganesh et al, because a system that can track changes and undo those changes allows suitable recovery operations in the event of a system failure or aborted transaction (Ganesh et al col. 1 lines 26-28).

As to claim 7, Kambhammettu et al, as modified, teaches the step of storing the reverse of the detected changes as change records in the database (Ganesh et al col. 3 lines 31-34).

As to claim 8, Kambhammettu et al, as modified, teaches the steps of:

selecting change records from the database pursuant to specified criteria (Kambhammettu et al lines 3-6 of paragraph [0035]),

applying the reverse of the selected change records to the data items referred to by the selected change records in order to return the data items to their state prior to the occurrence of the changes stored in the selected change records (Ganesh et al col. 3 lines 39-41).

As to claim 36, Kambhammettu et al, as modified, teaches said computer program:

determines the reverse of the changes stored in the selected change records (Ganesh et al col. 3 lines 31-34), and

applies the reverse of the selected change records to the data items referred to by the selected change records in order to return the data items to their state prior to the occurrence of the selected change records (Ganesh et al col. 3 lines 39-41).

As to claim 38, Kambhammettu et al, as modified, teaches said computer program stores the reverse of the detected changes as change records in the database (Ganesh et al col. 3 lines 31-34).

As to claim 39, Kambhammettu et al, as modified, teaches said computer program:

selects specified change records from the database pursuant to specified criteria (Kambhammettu et al lines 3-6 of paragraph [0035]),

applies the reverse of the selected change records to the data items referred to by the selected change records in order to return the data items to their state prior to the occurrence of the selected change records (Ganesh et al col. 3 lines 39-41).

5. Claims 2 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kambhamettu et al (U.S. Publication 2003/0005109 A1) in view of Nielsen (U.S. Patent Number 6,055,570).

As to claim 2, Kambhammettu et al does not explicitly teach the step of limiting the detection of changes to only data items matching specified criteria.

Nielsen teaches the step of limiting the detection of changes to only data items matching specified criteria (col. 2 lines 54-59).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the method of tracking changes to data items taught by Kambhammettu et al by the method of subscribing to update monitors taught by Nielsen because limiting the detection of changes to only data items matching specified criteria allows users to check for updates of content of interest (Nielsen col. 2 lines 24-26).

As to claim 33, Kambhammettu et al, as modified, teaches said computer program limits the detection of changes to only data items matching specified criteria (Nielsen col. 2 lines 54-59).

6. Claims 6 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kambhamettu et al (U.S. Publication 2003/0005109 A1) in view of Sutherland (U.S. Patent Number 7,003,776 B2).

As to claim 6, Kambhammettu et al does not explicitly teach the step of applying the changes stored in the selected change records to similar data items on a different computer system to cause the same changes on the different computer system.

Sutherland teaches the step of applying the changes stored in the selected change records to similar data items on a different computer system to cause the same changes on the different computer system (col. 2 lines 23-27, integrating changes from a first object to a second object).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the method of tracking changes to data items taught by Kambhammettu et al by the method of integrating changes from a first object to a second object taught by Sutherland, because a method that can track changes and apply changes from a first object to a second object allows the integration of changes detected in a first object with a second object.

As to claim 37, Kambhammettu et al, as modified, teaches said computer program applies the selected change records to similar data items on a different computer system to cause the same changes on the different computer system (Sutherland col. 2 lines 23-27, integrating changes from a first object to a second object).

7. Claims 12 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kambhamettu et al (U.S. Publication 2003/0005109 A1) in view of Kruger et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,738,970 B1).

As to claim 12, Kambhammettu et al does not explicitly teach the step of detecting links from a data item to other data items.

Kruger et al teaches the step of detecting links from a data item to other data items (col. 6 lines 19-21).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the method of tracking changes to data items taught by Kambhammettu et al by the method of detecting links from a data item to other data items because detecting links from a data item to other data items would enable the automatic identification of changes made to a computer system during the installation of computer software (Kruger et al col. 2 lines 36-38).

As to claim 43, Kambhammettu et al, as modified, teaches said computer program detects links from a data item to other data items (Kruger et al col. 6 lines 19-21).

8. Claims 17-19, 29-31, 49-51, and 61-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kambhamettu et al (U.S. Publication 2003/0005109 A1) in view of Ciapala et al (U.S. Publication 2005/0091373 A1).

As to claim 17, Kambhammettu et al does not explicitly teach the step of detecting communication attempts by the selected processes.

Ciapala et al teaches the step of detecting communication attempts by the selected processes (lines 6-8 of paragraph [0074]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the method of tracking changes to data items taught by Kambhammettu et al by the method of tracing tasks in a distributed environment taught by Ciapala et al because a method that tracks changes and detects communication attempts can track a task through the various components of a distributed application (Ciapala et al lines 2-4 of paragraph [0075]).

As to claim 18, Kambhammettu et al, as modified, teaches the steps of:

determining any processes that are the destination of the communication attempts (Ciapala et al lines 6-10 of paragraph [0074]),

detecting changes made by the destination processes to data items (Ciapala et al lines 17-18 of paragraph [0074]), and

storing the detected changes as change records in the database (Kambhammettu et al lines 7-8 of paragraph [0014]).

As to claim 19, Kambhammettu et al, as modified, teaches the steps of:

detecting that the communication attempts are to processes on a remote computer system (Ciapala et al lines 6-10 of paragraph [0074]),

determining any processes on the remote computer system that are the destination of the communication attempts (Ciapala et al lines 6-10 of paragraph [0074]),

detecting changes made by the destination processes to data items (Ciapala et al lines 17-18 of paragraph [0074]), and

storing the detected changes as change records in the database (Kambhammettu et al lines 7-8 of paragraph [0014]).

As to claim 29, Kambhammettu et al, as modified, teaches the step of detecting communication attempts by the selected processes (Ciapala et al lines 6-8 of paragraph [0074]).

As to claim 30, Kambhammettu et al, as modified, teaches the steps of

determining any processes that are the destination of the communication attempts (Ciapala et al lines 6-10 of paragraph [0074]),

detecting changes made by the destination processes to data items (Ciapala et al lines 17-18 of paragraph [0074]),

recording the detected changes in a session history (Kambhammettu et al lines 2-5 of paragraph [0036]), and

storing the session history as a session record in the database (Kambhammettu et al lines 2-5 of paragraph [0036]).

As to claim 31, Kambhammettu et al, as modified, teaches the steps of

detecting that the communication attempts are to processes on a remote computer system (Ciapala et al lines 6-10 of paragraph [0074]),

determining any processes on the remote computer system that are the destination of the communication attempts (Ciapala et al lines 6-10 of paragraph [0074]),

detecting changes made by the destination processes to data items (Ciapala et al lines 17-18 of paragraph [0074]),

recording the detected changes in a session history (Kambhammettu et al lines 2-5 of paragraph [0036]), and

storing the session history as a session record in the database (Kambhammettu et al lines 2-5 of paragraph [0036]).

As to claim 49, Kambhammettu et al, as modified, teaches said computer program detects communication attempts by the selected processes (Ciapala et al lines 6-8 of paragraph [0074]).

As to claim 50, Kambhammettu et al, as modified, teaches said computer program determines any processes that are the destination of the communication attempts (Ciapala et al lines 6-10 of paragraph [0074]),

detects changes made by the destination processes to data items (Ciapala et al lines 17-18 of paragraph [0074]), and

stores the detected changes as change records in the database (Kambhammettu et al lines 7-8 of paragraph [0014]).

As to claim 51, Kambhammettu et al, as modified, teaches said computer program

detects that the communication attempts are to processes on a remote computer system (Ciapala et al lines 6-10 of paragraph [0074]),

determines any processes on the remote computer system that are the destination of the communication attempts (Ciapala et al lines 6-10 of paragraph [0074]),

detects changes made by the destination processes to data items (Ciapala et al lines 17-18 of paragraph [0074]), and

stores the detected changes as change records in the database (Kambhammettu et al lines 7-8 of paragraph [0014]).

As to claim 61, Kambhammettu et al, as modified, teaches said computer program detects communication attempts by the selected processes (Ciapala et al lines 6-8 of paragraph [0074]).

As to claim 62, Kambhammettu et al, as modified, teaches said computer program

determines any processes that are the destination of the communication attempts (Ciapala et al lines 6-10 of paragraph [0074]),

detects changes made by the destination processes to data items (Ciapala et al lines 17-18 of paragraph [0074]),

records the detected changes in a session history (Kambhammettu et al lines 2-5 of paragraph [0036]), and

stores the session history as a session in the searchable database (Kambhammettu et al lines 2-5 of paragraph [0036]).

As to claim 63, Kambhammettu et al, as modified, teaches said computer program

detects that the communication attempts are to processes on a remote computer system (Ciapala et al lines 6-10 of paragraph [0074]),

determines any processes on the remote computer system that are the destination of the communication attempts (Ciapala et al lines 6-10 of paragraph [0074]),

detects changes made by the destination processes to data items (Ciapala et al lines 17-18 of paragraph [0074]),

records the detected changes in a session history (Kambhammettu et al lines 2-5 of paragraph [0036]), and

stores the session history as a session in the searchable database (Kambhammettu et al lines 2-5 of paragraph [0036]).

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- U.S. Publication 2003/0097381 A1, issued to Detweiler et al, for teaching a method of detecting changes to a local data store and updating a global change data store.
- U.S. Publication 2005/0193031 A1, issued to Midgley et al, for teaching capturing changes to a data file as the data file is being modified.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul J. Sommerfeld whose telephone number is 571 272-6545. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:45 am - 4:15pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim T. Vo can be reached on 571 272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TIM VO
PRIMARY EXAMINER